



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

days later Cicero had the disappointing news (x. 16. 2) that Cato had abandoned Sicily. He accordingly abandoned his daring plans, announced his purpose to go to Greece (*ibid.* 6), and we hear no more of the plot. Three weeks later he sailed for Pompey's camp.

Caelius' loyalty to Caesar was always in doubt; his letters to Cicero, except *Fam.* viii. 16, written at Caesar's orders, are full of complaints and regrets, insisting that he joined Caesar only through love of Curio and spite at Claudius. A year later he actually started a foolhardy revolt of just the type that one would best characterize as *Caelianum aliquid*, and of course met his fate. Curio because of Caesar's generous portrayal (*Bell. Civ.* ii. 23 ff.) has come down in history as faithful unto death, but Caelius and Cicero who knew him best knew that his spirited behavior concealed a vacillating mind steadied by no principles (*Fam.* ii. 13. 2; viii. 4. 2; viii. 6. 5). In fact, Curio had little reason to love Caesar. In 59 he had carried his attacks upon the triumvirs so far as to be accused by Vettius of heading a tyrannicide plot (*Att.* ii. 18 and 24). In the following years Caesar angered him by studiously ignoring him, according to Caelius (*Fam.* viii. 4. 2). Before the war Caesar needed the services of an aedile and paid a high price for his adherence, presently assigning him the task of clearing Sicily, but still did not fully trust him (*ille ipse Curio suspectus*). On his way to Sicily, Curio called on Cicero and freely expressed his doubts: "Curio mecum vixit, jacere Caesarem putans offensione populari, Siciliaeque diffidens si Pompeius navigare coepisset" (*Att.* x. 7. 3, about April 22). These hints made a deep impression, for in the next letter Cicero says (x. 8. 2): "Si pelletur [Caesar ex Hispania] . . . ipsum Curionem ad eum [Pompeium] transiturum putem." It is very likely therefore that Cicero's plot in May was based upon fairly clear hints that he had received from Caelius on January 7 and from Curio in April.

TENNEY FRANK

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE

#### NOTE ON EURIPIDES' *TROADES* 423-26.

Κα. ἡ δεινὸς ὁ λάτρης. τί ποτ' ἔχουσι τοῖνομα,  
κῆρυκες, ἐν ἀπέχθῃμα πάγκοινον βροτοῖς,  
οἱ περὶ τυράννους καὶ πόλεις ὑπηρέται;

Professor Murray, exercising the prerogative of the poet and ignoring perhaps the touch of colloquialism in δεινός as he does that in χυνός (432), translates interestingly:

How fierce a slave! . . . O Heralds, Heralds! Yea,  
Voices of Death; and mists are over them  
Of dead men's anguish, like a diadem,  
These weak abhorred Things that serve the hate  
Of kings and peoples! . . .

And Miss Jane Harrison in her *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, p. 172, seriously sustains the thesis that Euripides in harping on the name κήρυκες intends an etymological pun on κήρ. Such verbal plays are, of course, common enough in Euripides. And I will waive the point that he usually calls attention to them more explicitly, and also the possible consideration that to a Greek ear the syllabification would be against this association of ideas which Miss Harrison illustrates by the phrase (*italics hers*) "A Kerish name." The real ground of my scepticism is that there is another simpler explanation of Hecuba's affected hesitation to pronounce the name which can be confirmed from the same play and from a wide range of literature. In line 869 Menelaus says:

ἦκω δὲ τὴν τάλαιναν—οὐ γὰρ ἡδέως  
ὄνομα δάμαρτος ἦ ποτ' ἦν ἐμῇ λέγω—

I will leave it to the anthropologists to illustrate such nominal taboos from non-literary sources, primitive or savage. In "Iamblichus," *Vit. Pythag.* 255 there is a good case of the honorific avoidance of the proper name. See *Classical Philology*, XII, 436. But what we have in Euripides is the more familiar psychology of the real or scornfully affected unwillingness to pronounce a hated name or title. "There are persons," says Hazlitt, "not only whose praise but whose very names we cannot bear to hear." *τούτους*, says Herodotus, ii. 128, ὑπὸ μίσους οὐ κάρτα θέλουσι Αἰγύπτιοι ὀνομάζειν.

That sad place

Which yet to name my spirit loathes and fears,

says Tennyson's Iphigenia in the earlier editions. I will not argue that this is specially feminine psychology, though Penelope's ἐποψόμενος Κακοίλιον οὐκ ὀνομάστην (*Od.* xix. 260) and Hecuba's δυσώνυμοι νῆες Ἀχαιῶν (*Il.* vi. 255) and many of my other examples might tempt an ingenious philologist to maintain this thesis. In Eurip. *Hec.* 714, for instance, the outraged Hecuba exclaims, ἄρρητ' ἀνονόμαστα. At all events the feeling is common and my examples are only a few chosen at random from many. The modern novelist is aware of it, and "Oliver Onions" writes (*Debit Account*, p. 205), "She spoke of Evie repeatedly as your wife. Obstinate she refused to use her name." Shakespeare as usual furnishes the best illustrations of any human feeling. In *Winter's Tale*, II, 1, Leontes cries,

O thou thing!

Which I'll not call a creature of thy place.

The name, of course, need not be finally omitted. The affected delay yields the same effect. In *Antony and Cleopatra*, III, 11, the infuriated Antony says,

So saucy with the hand of she here, what's her name  
Since she was Cleopatra?

This is precisely the movement of the Euripides passage, *τί ποτ' ἔχουσι τοῦνομα—κήρυκες*, bringing in the name after the contemptuous query. A periphrasis delaying the name or specific word may produce a similar effect of intense passion, as e.g., Spanish Tragedy, 750,

And there is Nemesis and Furies and things called whips.

PAUL SHOREY

---

#### A CORRECTION ON *δέ γε*

In the April number of *Classical Philology*, p. 173, it is stated that Bonitz' Aristotelian index does not record *δέ γε*. This is an inadvertence due to correction of proofs at a distance and the fact that *γέ* is out of its alphabetical place in the index. The cases of *δέ γε* and *οὐδέ γε* cited there—all, I believe, from the Categories and mainly examples of the ordinary adversative argumentative use—do not affect the little that was said about Aristotle in the article.

PAUL SHOREY